



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—ON THE RECESSION OF THE LATIN ACCENT IN CONNECTION WITH MONOSYLLABIC WORDS AND THE TRADITIONAL WORD-ORDER.

PART II.

THE LATIN ACCENT AND THE TRADITIONAL WORD-ORDER.

In a previous paper I sought to emphasize the fact that a very great number of Latin word-combinations possess recessive accentuation, and hence, in accordance with current usage, may properly be classed among the Latin 'separable' or 'improper' *composita*. This form of statement is not, however, sufficiently clear, and it seems worth while to define more precisely the conditions under which a recessive accent arises in the Latin sentence, and to illustrate the actual process by some concrete examples. It is probable, for example, that most Latin scholars, if asked to explain the recessive accent in *transfero* or *trans fero* (as it is not infrequently written in the Roman word-division), would say that the accent is *tráns fêro*, and not *trans féro*, because we have to deal here with a compound verb and cases of genuine composition require a recessive accentuation. Thus the whole explanation is commonly made to turn upon the process of *composition*, as though in this process we had reached the primary cause of accentual change and did not need to examine also into the effects of simple juxtaposition. So far, however, as concerns those classical languages which possess a recessive accent-system, such an assumption is wholly unscientific.¹ An historically correct statement must be somewhat as follows: The accent is recessive in *trans fero*, because a *traditional word-order*, i. e., a preferred and usual word-order, had been established already in I. E., in accordance with which certain adverbs, the so-called verbal prefixes, were commonly placed immediately before the verb (Delbrück, Syntakt. Forsch. V, p. 44 f.).² In prehistoric Latin this traditional word-order

¹ For the value and meaning of composition, cf. the references given above, A. J. P. XXV 158.

² That is, in I. E. and also in Sanskrit these adverbs (prepositions) held precisely the same relation to the verb that the negatives *non*, *ne*, *nec* and *haud* hold to the Latin verb; cf. Delbrück, l. l., IV 147: "Es war also das Ver-

had no doubt gained still further at the expense of the occasional order, but apparently an invariable order had not been established for any of these combinations; cf. *ob vos sacro, sub vos placo* Festus 190, 2 M. During the Latin historical period, however, the traditional word-order became virtually an invariable order in the case of some of the prefixes, as in *trans fero*. No process of composition has, however, taken place originally in any of these verbs, but only juxtaposition, and, from the purely technical point of view, Victor Henry (Comp. Gramm.², Engl. tr., p. 173) is quite right in refusing to admit the existence of any genuine compound verbs in Greek and Latin; in like manner what Stolz (Hist. Gramm. I 404) observes of the combinations *denuo, ilico, profecto*, etc., applies equally to these so-called verbal compounds: "das eigentliche charakteristische Moment der Zusammensetzung fehlt bei diesen Verbindungen." Hence the combinations with *ante, post*, etc., in an adverbial sense, i. e., *anteparta* (cf. *postpartor*, Pl.), *antedicta, contradicta, infrascripta* (Inscr.), *postgeniti* (v. still other examples in Stolz, l. l., 398), though they are regarded with disfavor by many editors of classical texts, are yet, in point of fact, as good Latin 'compounds' as the majority of the verbs in question. Indeed, provided the traditional order can be fully established, it is not even necessary that the two parts of a Latin 'compound' should belong to the same clause, e. g., *nimirum = nisi, mirum est* (Ribbeck, Latein. Partik., p. 17).

hăltniss der Negation zum verbum finitum dasselbe wie das Verhăltniss der Prăposition, es trat keine Zusammensetzung der Negation mit dem Verbum ein, aber eine enge Verbindung zwischen der Negation und der einzelnen Verbalform. Dieses Verhăltniss hat sich in den europăischen Sprachen bei einigen Verben behalten. Im Lateinischen gehřrt hierher namentlich *nescio, nequeo, nolo* [aus **nevolo*], im Slavischen die Verben welche bedeuten *sein, haben, wollen, wissen*;" cf. also Hirt, Der Indogermanische Akzent, p. 171. It is with good reason then that we not only have in Latin the accents *nėqueo, nėscio, nėlego, nėcuto, hăuscio, nōnnihil*, etc., but, as will be shown later, we have, if the negation is prefixed to iambic verbs, regularly *nōn queo, nōn facis, nėque agis*, etc.; thus the old rule has been very largely preserved in Latin as well as in Lithuanian and Slavic, that "die Negation steht auf einer Linie mit den Prăverbien" (Hirt, l. l., p. 306). If no Latin verbal *composita* are formed with *non* itself, this is chiefly due to the late development of this particular negation; cf., however, *nonnulli, nonnumquam*, etc., and, in Inscr., *nonlicebit, nondebuerunt* (Corssen II 881). I may add that we apparently still find in early Latin some traces of the free I. E. position of the negative in relation to the verb; for in Tru. 877 all recent editors read *ne facere si velim* for the MS *re facere* (cf. Habich, De negationum usu Plaut., p. 29), although in Mo. 124 *reparcunt* (BCD) is usually retained (*neparcunt* L).

I have said that an invariable order was finally established in Latin in the case of some of the verbal prefixes; in perhaps the majority of cases, however, the order never became even approximately invariable, especially in the case of the prefixes *ante*, *circum*, *inter*, *praeter*, *post*, *super*, etc., which form in general only separable *composita*. Yet it is easy to show from Latin verse and from the grammarians that the accent was as strongly recessive in those combinations like *supér erit*, *anté tulit*, *circúm dedit*, which possess only a traditional order, as in those which have gained an invariable order like *tráns fero*. The Latin recessive accent is not due then primarily to the process of 'genuine composition', but it is due to the traditional word-order, which includes genuine composition and much more besides. Thus the verbal prefixes are far from being the only words which may be used to exemplify the I. E. traditional word-order and its effects. Of all the I. E. word-orders the best-known is that in accordance with which the object immediately precedes the verb (Delbrück, I. 1., III 24), and the question is entirely legitimate whether, in cases where the object-accusative precedes an iambic verb like *velim*, the accent recedes or not. In fact, we find evidence that both the accent *aquám-velim* and the accent *áquam vélim* were here known; for Plautus allows such apparent double iambic verse-closes as Am. 1058 *áquám-velim*; Au. 417 *cócúm-decet*; Cas. 395 *lúcrúm-facit*; cf. Inc. inc. fab. 92 R. com. *misericórdiám-rogat* (Klotz, Grundz., p. 244; Hauler, Einl. Phor., p. 38 n. 1), thus treating these combinations as quadrisyllabic words. Similarly, although the word-order is far from invariable (e. g. often *dare operam*, *operam* . . . *dare*, also *agis nugas* Ci. 581), we find Lachmann's law regularly observed in *operám-datís*, *-damús*, *-daté*, *-daré*,¹ *nugás-agís*, *-agit* (10 times; examples in Lodge, Lex. Pl., p. 81); hence Lindsay's view of the admissible character of the accents *fidém-do*, *coctúm-dabo*, *factúm-volo*, *missám-face* (Journal of Phil. XX 147; The Captivi, p. 369) seems a probable

¹ With the single exception, Ba. 98 *operám-därē* (troch.); anap. is St. 311 *operám-dätís*. The accent *operám-do*, etc., is well attested by the critical feet viz., As. 449 *operám das*; Per. 372; Ph. 87;—but was not the only accent in use, as Men. 1009 *óperam da³bo* et, and also in 1st ft., as Ba. 103 *óperam da¹bo*. [I use '1st ft.' throughout in the meaning '1st ft. of a colon'; also numerals written *below* the line indicate *iambic* verse; written *in* the line, *trochaic* verse.] *Pessúm dare* (9 times) has both an invariable order and accent in the dramatists.

one. Cf. also the pronominal combinations originally containing an oblique case, which are often written as one word, i. e. *quodlubet*, *quoilubet*, *quolubet*, *quidvis* (Prehn, Pronom. Indef., p. 28 f.), *quidvoles*, *quidvolet*, etc., and observe the vowel-weakening seen in *simus* and *libet* for *sumus* and *lubet* respectively (Lindsay, L. L., p. 29). Many indications show, however, that the separate accentuation, as in *âquam vêlim*, was much more usual in such cases, e. g. the non-observance of Lachmann's law in examples like Ep. 691 *morâm faci's*, *quom égo*; cf. also As. 380 *officium faci's*, etc.

It is in connection, however, with certain special classes of words which were pronounced in close connection with the following word, that the effects of the traditional word-order are best seen, viz., the pronouns, the conjunctions, the prepositions and monosyllabic words in general. The case of the monosyllables and the prepositions will be treated here¹. If the dialogue verse of the dramatists be examined with reference to those I. E. word-orders which place the monosyllabic object pronouns or the monosyllabic sentence-introducing conjunctions and pronouns²—also the subject pronouns—before the verb, we shall find that in all these cases the recession of the accent is fairly complete. For we not only always find in a tribrach sequence *quód êdis, út aïs*, etc., but in dactylic and cretic sequences all combinations like *quod faci's*, *quae cupis, id petis, si sapi's, hoc age, non queo, id scio, te volo, te rogo, ne time*, etc., are subjected with remarkable strictness to the difficult law of Lachmann respecting the use of dactylic and cretic word-forms³, i. e., except in the first foot of a colon, such combinations can enter the verse only in the form *quódfaci's*,

¹ For a separate treatment of the dissyllabic pronouns and conjunctions, v. my article in the forthcoming volume of the Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc. for 1904.

² The conjunctions, when followed immediately by the verb, often form a complete sentence, as *sí-sapi's, sí-faci's*, and the accent of the more frequent combinations is extended by analogy; cf. also the I. E. 'enclisis' of the verb in this position (Hirt, l. l., 307 ff.), which has perhaps been preserved in Latin. Similarly in the case of clauses which consist only of subject and verb, the subject-pronoun precedes the verb (Delbrück, III 13), e. g. *tú-faci's*; in general, the word-order subject + verb must be recognized as sometimes causing recession in Latin, as in the verse-closes Poe. 447 *quando âmór-iubet*; Tri. 533 *ille âgér-fuit*.

³ Similarly even in Phaedrus (I 10, 9 *pérididisse quód-pet'is*) *quod-petis* counts as a trisyllabic word in justifying an app. double iambic verse-close, and Havet's correction (ed. Phaed., p. 181) is needless.

sisapis, népavé, nónpotést, útdecét, útsolés, quám r[em] agis, quíd t[u] ais, etc., and not at all in the form *quód fácís, nē pávė, nǫn pǫtěst*; very rarely as *quod fácís, id vǫlo*, etc. Finally, by extension of usage, the accent recedes upon any monosyllabic pronoun or adverb prefixed to the verb, i. e. *tíbi aít, hinc-agis, iám-scío*; the analogy of the very numerous verbal *composita* like *pérvidet* may perhaps have been an important factor here. It should further be noted that these conclusions which we have reached respecting the accented character of monosyllabic pronouns, conjunctions and adverbs prefixed to the verb, and which are equally true for prefixed pyrrhic pronouns, conjunctions and adverbs, e. g., always *béne-voló, béne facis, ita scio, égo-scío* (see below p. 269), *nēque volo*, and never *bene fácís, ego scío*, etc.¹, are in general agreement with the probable history of Latin verbal accentuation. Thus, according to Hirt, Indog. Akz., p. 171, it is extremely likely that Latin originally retained the extensive I. E. 'enclisis' of the verb and constantly accented the prefixed adverb², as appears from verbal forms like *conficio*, earlier **cón facio*, although in historical Latin, to be sure, the accentuation of the prefixed monosyllable or pyrrhic word is limited to those cases which are permitted by the three and four-syllable laws.

The preceding statement may seem to assign too great a role to an abstract traditional word-order and to take too little account of concrete cases. I have purposely chosen it as the most convenient form of expression, but the principle actually involved in the process is probably this: that in every traditional word-order so many familiar word-groups like *quíd agis, quód ames*,

¹ Exceptions to this tendency are very few, viz., in the 1st ft., Cas. 54 *sibi fǫre*; Mi. 117 *ubi símus*; Mer. 778. Within the verse I have noted only: Mi. 36 *ehem, scǫ*; Nov. com. fr. 93 *age móve te*; the foll. constitute no real exception: Per. 190 *séd-ita voǫlo te*; Au. 608 *tú-modo caǫve*; Mo. 20. It is true that—owing partly to the recessive tendency, partly to other causes—the disposition to prefer $\cup\cup$, $\cup\cup$ to $\cup\cup$, $\cup\cup$ is general in dramatic verse, but I do not think that I am mistaken in saying that this tendency reaches its height in connection with the verb and in combinations like *méus pater* (Lindsay, *The Captivi*, p. 369²), *érus meus, érus tuos* (*erus méus* only in anap. and in 1st ft. iamb. and bacch.; no real exception is Per. 259 *nám-erus méus*; in Cur. 177 either *quód-meus érus* or *quod meús érus* is possible); cf. also Luchs, *Comm. Pros.* II 13¹.

² For other traces of this I. E. 'enclisis,' cf. Hirt, l. l., p. 307: Im germanischen Alliterationsvers ist gewöhnlich ein selbständiges Adverbium höher betont als das Verbum, e. g. Ags. *úpp beran*.

quod facis must arise with a recessive accent that a general type is eventually established, to which the accent even of rare combinations is made to conform.¹ Quite similarly, in the case of rare verbal *composita* like *exbibō* (only Mi. 832) or even *expūto*, the recessive accent really exists because the more frequent combinations like *effero*, *expeto*, etc., have first established a general accentual type. With this explanation of my meaning, I shall continue to refer to an abstract traditional order.

The demonstrative, relative and interrogative pronouns also possess an I. E. traditional word-order, i. e., they are as a rule prefixed² to their substantive (Delbrück, l. l., III 35). Here also we find not only always *quīs ērus*, *hic equos*, *hic homo*, but also with very few exceptions, *quis-modūs*, *hic-locūs*, *hic-diēs*, etc.; for examples of a similar usage in other I. E. languages, cf. Hirt, l. l., p. 324. Two other traditional orders show, at least in the sensitive tribrach sequence, a complete recession: (1) The personal and demonstrative pronouns and pronominal adverbs attach themselves to the sentence-introducing conjunctions and pronouns (Kämpf, Pronom. Personal., pp. 36, 31), i. e. *séd ego*, *quīs ea*, *nisi ita*, etc. (2) The subject-noun attaches itself directly to the S.-I. conjunctions and pronouns (Delbrück, l. l., V 16, 23), i. e. *ét erus*, *séd erus*. This habit has apparently been extended also to the oblique cases of the noun in this position, and since all such cases involve Wackernagel's toneless 'second position', we have here also perhaps the retention of an I. E. 'enclisis'. The cases which have been so far mentioned are all of them closely connected with traditional orders; on the other hand, owing to the free position which belongs to the *adverb*³ in the sentence, nearly all adverbial combinations show a variable accent

¹ In many cases the retention of an original I. E. 'enclisis' is also possible, and in some cases it is highly probable.

² Just so Priscian, Keil III 31, 5, observes at some length that certain usually 'prefixed' words, such as the pronoun *hic* (e. g. *hic homo*) and the prohibitive *ne*, belong in almost the same category as the prepositions, which are the prefixed words (*praepositiones*) κατ' ἐξοχὴν, and for the accent of which see below (p. 262).

³ The adverb, being loosely connected with the verb which it modifies, freely varies in position; examples in Braune, *Observ. gramm.*, pp. 12, 33, 60; cf. Leo, *Nachr. d. Gött. Ges.*, 1895, p. 428: "Eine sehr lose Verbindung geht das Adverbium mit dem Verbum, das es bestimmt, eine minder lose mit dem Nomen oder Adverbium ein"; examples of the latter in Braune, pp. 12, 25, 51.

and no observance of Lachmann's law, e. g. Ba. 363 sí mägis úsus; Ad. 708 quí mägis mórem; Ru. 218 quí mínus sérvio; Cur. 622 te² male pérdat; Poe. 16, etc.; also Ad. 701 ni mägis; Cap. 430; we find always, however, in association with the adjective or adverb *tám-citó, támdiú, tám-malé*.

There is at least one great traditional Latin word-order, which is not wholly of I. E. origin, but is in large part the result of later development; viz., the order in accordance with which the preposition is prefixed to its case. Here also the accent regularly receded; for in tribrach sequences the dramatists accent always *in opus*, and in dactylic and cretic sequences they obey strictly Lachmann's law, i. e. *á patrē, in marē (immarē), inforó, summanús* (cf. *émtibí, váemihí, súo-sibí*, etc.), and only in the first foot either *á patrē* or *a pátre*, etc. Thus if we take a separable *compositum* like *apatre*, we shall be able to note the observance of the Lachmann-Ritschl law in the most minute and delicate particulars. For this form must either be placed in the verse-close, i. e. *á patrē*, or it must stand within the verse (1) as *ápatrē*; (2) as *ápatrē* (St. 71, P and ed. min.)¹; (3) as *ápatr[e]* \simeq . The shorts of *ápatrē* can neither in whole nor in part be used to form a resolved thesis, and if elision occur, the ultima must be elided into an accented syllable; thus the penult [*a*] *patr[e]*, [*in*] *for[o]* is doubly incapacitated from acting as a Brevis Brevians.² Similarly it may be shown from Ahlberg's collection that, after a

¹ This is a permissible license in the case of all dactylic words (cf. Leo on As. 250; Men. 762, and cf. even Maurenbrecher, Hiatus, p. 203 f.), for the reason that the regular verse-treatment of dactylic words *gives a sufficient clew to the reading of the verse independently of quantity*; cf. also Per. 398 vél-facé⁴; Eu. 12 quí-petít², unde is; et al.

² *Á* (*cám, dé, éx, pró*) *patre* occur 13 times in middle of verse with elision into an acute (Cas. 36; Men. 1112; 1113; Mo. 1127; Ps. 730; Tri. 771; 785; Vid. 115; And. 653; Hau. 235; Ad. 951; Ph. 607; 879), 12 times in verse-close (Ba. 665; Men. 31; Mer. 64; 68; Poe. 65; Tri. 741; 775; 778; Tru. 649; And. 252; Acc. fr. 654; Afran. fr. 310); *de pátre*, etc., with long penult, of course occurs later (Sen. H. F. 446; Thy. 310). Also *ad* (*in*, etc.) *mare* occurs 4 times with elision *m. v.* (Ba. 458; Mer. 354; 371; Ru. 295), 4 times *ult. v.* (Poe. 627; Ru. 34; 898; Tru. 564), while we find *in mare* (cf. *pectóre*) once: Tru. 565 hoc in ma^{re}re abit. \simeq *sene, cane, lare, grege, sale, love* occur 5 times with elision *m. v.* (Cas. 320; Ps. 871; Ad. 362; Hau. 1036; Laber. fr. 110), 6 times *ult. v.* (Am. 1125; Tri. 208; Per. 267; Mi. 966; Hau. 759; perioch. 10). No exception is Tri. 152 *dttriā-mília* (numeral + subst.), nor Tri. 940 *a¹d cāpūt ámnis* (1st ft.), but we find Hec. 842 in bré^{ve}, also once in 1st ft. e núce, Cur. 55, and in general we find *ad fôr[um]* (Ps. 1230, usually

preposition, an iambic word is excluded absolutely from the arsis of the proceleusmaticus, i. e. never *apud érūm*, *apud fôrūm*, *sine módō*, *sine málō*, *super ánnū*, *quōd in mánū*, but always *ápud-erūm*, *ápud-forūm*, *sine-modó*, *quōd in mánū*. As shown in the example *quōd in mánū* (Tri. 914; cf. *séd ōptume*, *épistulam*), the accent, in accordance with its general tendency, may sometimes recede still further, but it may not move forward, as in *quod in mánū*. It should be added that the absence of vowel-weakening in the prepositional *composita* is due chiefly to the free occurrence of tmesis-forms (e. g. *á bono patre*), since, wherever the tmesis-forms are excluded, vowel-weakening freely occurs, e. g. *per annos* (*per* . . . *annos*), but *perennis*; *per agros*, but *peregre*; *quotannis* (adv.), but *quotennis* (adj.); *in loco* (*in* . . . *loco*), but *ilico*. Finally, this 'enclitic' attachment of the noun to the preposition was, according to Hirt (l. l., 43, 299 ff.) a familiar construction in I. E. Both Germanic and Greek (cf. *ἐπίταν*, *ἐπέμπορον*, *διάρπικα*, etc.) preserve some traces of the construction, and Slavic has retained the old rule in actual use to the present day. In primitive Italian, according to v. Planta, Osk.-Umbr. Gramm. I 597, the preposition received the tone and the noun was apparently in all cases 'enclitic'. In historical Latin the old 'enclisis' is preserved not only in many combinations stereotyped as adverbs, e. g. *denuo*, *sedulo*, *ilico*, *comminus*, *eminus*, *protinus*, *antea*, *interea*, *interdiu*, *intervias*, *profecto*,¹ etc., but as a rule in all combinations of prep. and iambic noun.²

The recessive accentuation continued here throughout the classical age (cf. Quintil. I 5, 25 ff.; Annianus ap. Gell. VI 7). True, as we have already seen (A. J. P. XXV 151), the processes of 'recomposition', which give rise to *commando* for *commendo*, **de nóvo* (Fr. de nouveau) for *dénuo*, etc., existed to a limited

corrected on other grounds, cf. Kellerhoff, Studem. Stud. II 83) and *cum mā'ltō* (Ru. 923, in free troch. (?) oct., just as in immediately preceding line *susci'tēt*) only as we find *pectōre* and *pectōri*; for cases of latter outside 1st ft., cf. Klotz, Grundz., 63, 277 vs. Ahlberg, Corrept. iamb., 46.

¹ In Pl.'s time often still *prōfēcto*, as shown especially by the procel. Ps. 201: *id tibi prōfēctō*; cf. also St. 614 *per hōrtu'm*.

² This is the view now generally held by critical students of the Latin accent; see especially the excellent observations of Vendryes, *L'intensité initiale*, Paris, 1902, p. 108. In V.'s view also we have forms like *admodum*, *affatim*, instead of **admidum*, **affitim*, because their 'composition' or 'recomposition' is subsequent to the period when the law of vowel-weakening was effective; 'recomposition' seems to me here the important factor.

extent even in the earliest period, but they long remained of secondary importance and did not actually gain the mastery before the late Romance period. In the fifth century the recessive accent appears to have been still predominant; for the grammarians repeatedly class ordinary prepositional phrases like *cismare* and *in locum* among the *composita* in the same manner as *conficio*, *omnipotens*, etc. (Charisius, Keil, I 17, 3; Diom. I 436, 15; Dositheus, VII 389, 4; ib. 409, 27, etc.¹). Their disputes show also that *ét tamen*, *sét tamen*, *ét quidem*² and apparently *ét mihi*³ were still in actual use.

The verse of the quantitative poets to the latest age bears the same testimony to the general recession of the primary accent; thus often Lucil., Pompon., and Novius (B. C. 90), as Pomp. 66 a⁵ge anus; Nov. 50 u³bi ego; also Laber. 13 quēm ego; CLE.

¹So also, notwithstanding Gell. VI 7, *af fátim* was not the only accent in this period; for Priscian, III 75, 7 K., writes: 'affátim' a Graeco ἀφάτως, unde et corripitur 'fa', showing that some pronounced *dś fátim*, others *af fátim*. Further, while the imitation of the Greek rules for the accent of prepositions often creates the greatest confusion in the set statements of the grammarians on this subject (as in the alleged examples citrà forum, antè Iovem, Schöll, l. l., 181, 184), yet often also a correct statement is made, e. g. Diom. I 433, 5 (Schöll, p. 177): Item inveniuntur raro dissyllabae (praepositiones), quae acui desiderant, ut est *circúm*, *intér*. On the frequent imitation of the Greek rules, cf. Schöll, p. 65; for *af fátim*, v. Arator 2, 326.

²Cod. Bern. 83, Suppl., p. 184, 27 K. (Schöll, p. 194): Duas etiam partes vide, ne sub uno accentu pronunties, idest *verúm támen*, quod nihil est aliud, quam *sét támen*, *ét támen*, *ét quidem*: sic *verúm támen* ut duae efferendae sunt.—It is evident that all these accents were in actual use, just as the well-known *isté* and *tríginta*, which are also censured (cf. Skutsch, Forsch. 130 f.); besides, we have *etquidem* expressly named as a *compositum*, Audax VII 349, 18, cf. CGL. II 335, 62, and Ahlberg, Procel. I 62 ff.; also *sitamen* Audax ib. 22; Probus IV 144, 3;—*verumtamen* and *attamen*—the latter not even mentioned by this writer—are often written together in MSS and texts. Abbreviations for all 5 combinations are found in the Comm. Not. Tironian. Similarly the dramatists always (8 times) accent *verúm tamen*, although the intermediate character of the combination allows them to disregard Lachmann's law (4 times: Mi. 585 verúm tāmēn, dí; Ba. 1074; Ru. 890; Men. 253); also, outside of the 1st ft., we find always *ét tamén*, *sét tamén*, *dt tamén*, except for disregard of L.'s law twice: Naev. fr. 79 át tāmēn álii; And. 59. So, except once in 1st ft. (Hau. 1012 níhilo mínus), we find always níhiló minus (Men. 953; Poe. 363; Ph. 597; Enn. trag. 368; Phaed. III prol. 48), with disregard of L.'s law once (Enn. tr. 368).

³Servius ad Aen. II 124 (Schöll, p. 159¹): Et mihi iam multi crudele caneant.] quidam graviter pronuntiandum tradunt 'mihi';—where, acc. to the sense, the pronoun is fairly emphatic.

(Büch.) 45, 3 $\acute{e}t$ ego; 103, 1 $qu\acute{o}d$ ego; Phaed. 1, 17, 2 $\acute{a}b$ $\acute{o}v\grave{e}$; 1, 9, 5 $qu\acute{i}d$ $\acute{i}t\grave{a}$; Mar. Victor., Gram. Lat. VI 92, 12 $qu\acute{i}d$ $\acute{i}t\grave{a}$ (sotadean); Paulinus Nol. 24, 407 breve $p\acute{e}r$ $\acute{i}t\grave{e}r$. Since, however, a light tribrach like *ab ove* is, upon the whole, conventionally avoided by the later poets (cf. Quint. 9, 4, 140), an anapaestic sequence like *áb eō* is more frequent; e. g., Auson. Lud. 42 *sed quid ego istaéc*; Phaed. 3, 19, 5 $qu\acute{o}d$ $\acute{i}t\grave{e}r$ (v. Havet, p. 160); 3, prol., 46 $qu\acute{o}d$ $e\acute{r}it$; 1, 21, 5 $\acute{a}d$ $e\acute{u}m$; Syr. sent. 209 a^3b $e\acute{o}$; 242 $\acute{i}n$ $e\acute{u}m$; Varro $\gamma\acute{\nu}\omega\theta\iota$ σ. 9 $\acute{u}t$ $am\acute{o}r$; CLE. 68, 4; 238, 2, etc. A primary accent of this kind is disregarded only in the first foot, as Sen. Tro. 607 *quid ágis*; CLE. 194. 195 *et íta*. A secondary accent of this kind is also usually observed, as Cat. 63, 63 *égo aduléscens*; App. Syr. sent. 63, R., etc., but is freely disregarded in preparing for the verse-close, as Hor. Ep. 17, 74 *ego ínimicís equés*; Syr. sent. 47.

PLAUTINE USAGE IN TRIBRACH GROUPS.

In the preceding statement I have attempted to give some general account of the recession of the Latin accent both in tribrach and in dactylic groups. I shall now offer a more extended proof of the correctness of this account, and for this purpose it will be convenient to treat these groups separately. I shall begin with the case of tribrach groups.

It is a well-known rule of Latin iambic verse that a tribrach word admits the metrical accent as a rule only in agreement with the grammatical accent, i. e. regularly, *génére*, very rarely *genére*; similarly *cālāmī*|tatem, almost never *cālāmī*|tatém¹. Hence if

¹ See TAPA. XXXIV 64 ff. In the treatment of exceptions which is there given a reference should have been made to the cases collected by Seyffert, Bursian's Jahresb. 1894, p. 274; add also *illíc-hómo* Ep. 45; 671 (Luchs, Hermes VI 279), cf. *altrínscús*, Ps. 357, etc.; for late authors, v. Meyer, Beob. d. Wortacc., p. 115 ff. On the other hand, *ítáne* (Mi. 1120) and *hícíne* (Mo. 507) should not have been confidently cited (p. 65), cf. Schrader, De -ne . . . prosodia, pp. 15, 12. With respect to the observance of the secondary tribrach accent, as in *cālāmī*|tátém (p. 66), credit should have been given to Seyffert, l. l., p. 272, for completing Lindsay's statement and adding Ru. 218 (*misérí-córdíór*), Mo. 802 to the exceptions in bacchiac verse. The observance of this accent is important, for, as is well-known, some critics (e. g. Meyer, l. l., p. 38) refuse to admit any influence of the grammatical accent in Latin verse and explain the non-occurrence of *génére* by a supposed rule that the two closing shorts of a polysyllabic word cannot be used as a resolved arsis; such an hypothesis wholly fails, however, to explain the non-occurrence of *cālāmī*|tatém.

Latin tribrach groups like *sed erus*, *sed ape* | ritur have adopted a similar accentuation, they must in general receive the verse-accent only upon the initial syllable, although the verse admits equally well both the initial and the medial accent (TAPA. XXXIV 68 ff.). In fact, so great a majority of the tribrach and anapaestic groups which actually occur consist of the recessive word-orders named above that the Latin sentence-rhythm appears to have been influenced at this point, and recession has usually occurred even in purely casual combinations. A very simple proof of this general recession in both tribrach and anapaestic groups may be given. As is well known, the iambic proceleusmaticus regularly requires the agreement of word and verse accent, e. g. *vidēs hōdie, ibi prius* (Ahlberg, Procel. I 36 f.). If now we examine the complete collection of proceleusmatici which has been made by Ahlberg, we find 48 examples of the type *vides āb ea* (inclusive of 11 examples, which involve syllable-shortening, as in *rogat ūt illum*, Eu. 618¹), but of the type *sed ab ēā* only a single case, i. e. Ci. 594 *ego ad ānīm*, which belongs to the license of the first foot.² Further it may easily be shown that the avoidance of the types *sed ab ēā*, *sed ut āgās*, *neque ego īta* is not due to the formation of either the thesis or the arsis when taken separately (Ahlberg, l. l., 10 f., 11 f., 131 ff.); hence it must be due to the effect produced by the two formations taken conjointly, and this effect is none other than the unnatural accent *sed ab ēā*, *sed ut āgas*. In other words, we have a

It is interesting to note that in Czech also, which is a quantitative language but has developed besides an initial stress accent, "dans les mots du type $\cup \cup \cup$ les trois syllabes sont indépendantes, et l'intensité, très forte sur la première, devient faible sur la seconde pour disparaître sur la finale" (Vendryes, l. l., 132). So far as regards ancient testimonies upon the character of the Latin accent, I may add that *Vendryes and similar writers are perhaps mistaken in their statement that the Romans of the best period have absolutely identified the Latin accent with the Greek. On the contrary, Quintilian, XII 10, 33, appears to state that the Latin accent differs from the Greek in a quality of hardness or rigidity (rigore quodam), i. e., as I propose to show more fully in another place, in (comparative) inflexibility (of pitch).*

¹ Such occurrences in procell. prove against the doubts of Birt, Rhein. Mus. 51, 253, that *ūt illum* is a genuine Latin accent; cf. TAPA. XXXIV 75. The explanation there offered still seems to me essentially correct, though the *definite oxytonesis of the pronouns* should be more stressed, i. e. *illūm, omnēs* hence *ut illum, sed omnes*; cf. my forthcoming article in TAPA. 1904.

² No real exceptions occur in Poe. 1259 *ut hīc pāter-est*; Hec. 198 *quod hōc gēnus-est*; Ci. 5; Per. 851; St. 704.

legitimate procel. in *ubi is obiit*, Au. 15, where the accent recedes three syllables, but not in *ubi is obit*, where it recedes only two; in *quod in opere*, Hau. 73, but not in *quod in opus*, etc. Such a formation as *sed ab éa* occurs only in anapaests, as Poe. 1183 neque ab iūvēn|tute fbi; Ep. 541; Cas. 163, etc. The true formation of the procel. is seen in As. 143 ea sí erant; 818 nisi quídem illa; Poe. 1069 tuos ís erat; Mo. 182; Tri. 516; And. 858 (Ahlberg, pp. 154, 160); the remaining 42 examples are cited TAPA. XXXIV 77.

A second proof is afforded by collecting all the single examples of tribrach groups of the form ∪, ∪ ∪; for the method of measurement, cf. TAPA. XXXIV 78. In general, a recessive *primary* accent is alone admitted by Pl. in these groups; I have observed only five or six exceptions, two of which belong to the first foot, viz., Ps. 881 nam ego íta; Poe. 839 nisi e²rus. Also Au. 789 íta di fáciant. || Et mihi i⁴ta di fáciant; Mer. 655 si íd fore í²ta sat (so B, other MSS forte); probably phraseological is Mi. 362 mihi quóque pol í⁶ta-vidétur, cf. íta-vidétur, Cas. 360. Hau. 599, often míhi vidétur, etc.; Poe. 705 is scanned by Leo and ed. min. quid itá?, with *syllaba anceps* at change of speaker; cf. Luchs, Hermes VIII 114. In the effort to form legitimate verse-closes, however, Plautus and later poets (p. 265 above) much more frequently disregard the *secondary* accent of these groups, in the third foot from the end of both senarius and sept., viz., Men. 267 in Épidamnó duís, cf. málti²osé tamén, Mi. 562; Au. 105; Ba. 1065; Men. 316; Mi. 1168; Ps. 434; 878; Ru. 116; 1230; Tri. 618; 679;—very rarely in any other foot, as Cur. 341.

To illustrate the recessive accent of the various word-orders, I have used the ten plays Amph., Asin., Aul., Bacch., Capt., Men., Mil., Poen., Rud., Trin. The examples may be classified as follows:

I. PRONOUN + NOUN.—(a) Demonstr., interrog., relative and indef.: híc homo Am. 402; Cap. 793; Poe. 606; 1214; Tri. 892; 963; 1027;—híc equos Ba. 943; 944;—híc aduléscens Ba. 3; Poe. 96;—quís homo Am. 309; 625; 1121; Mi. 615; Ru. 870; Tri. 1176;—quís erus Am. 362;—quí homo Au. 790; Men. 301; Tri. 305;—quí erus As. 658;—quíd opus Mi. 636; 754;—siquíd opus As. 117¹;—quód itēr Enn. trag. 231.—(b) Pos-

¹ Also Ep. 288 néque opus; cf. Mi. 920. Ps. 349 quód opus (edd. opust); Poe. 436 quíd opus (so A; edd. opust). With *est* we have equally often *séd*

sessive¹: Mi. 127 méum erum Athénis; 1174 méum opus; Poe. 393 méa inimíca; 1127 o mí ere; Tri. 1110 méo ero amícus; Tru. 215 méa era; 213 méa era apúd nos; 800 túa era; often mí homo, And. 721, etc. (*Total* 34.)

II. PREPOSITION + NOUN OR PRONOUN.—Mi. 879 ín opus (in ópus, in 1st ft. Vid. 75);—ín Epidámno Men. 49; 70; 380 (bis) (in Épidamnó in verse-close Men. 267, cf. p. 267 above);—Ru. 818 cúm erö|huc; Ep. 306 égo agrüm|ín agrö | Attico; Tri. 305 áb ineúnte; 1019 áb aliéno; Men. 186 ín eo utérque; Mi. 1405 ád eam ut írem. (*Total* 11.)

III. S.-I. CONJUNCTION OR PRONOUN + NOUN.—Am. 452 quód erus; 974 ét era; Au. 278 út erus; 288 séd erus; cf. 826 ábi ere; Ba. 872 úbi erus; Cap. 223 sí erus; 1005 séd erus; ib. ét erus; Men. 1076 tú erus; Mi. 451 át erus; Poe. 264 quía erus; 589 quóm ero amánti; 826. 894 quám erus; Ru. 119 úbi erus; 347 néque erus; 1074 quód erus; cf. 1052. Tri. 617 ó ere. [Other examples in Pl. of *er*us are Au. 680; Mi. 859; Mo. 881; 1043; Per. 29; 259; 613; Ps. 1028;—*sed erús* occurs Am. 291; Cap. 241; Per. 514; Ps. 1150; Ru. 345;—*sed érus* only in the 1st ft., Poe. 839, and in Hec. 799 meam e³rus, where it is justified by the sense, cf. méum erum.] Au. 230 úbi onus; Poe. 857 át onus; Cur. 160 út anus; Ba. 936 séd equos; Cas. 811 sí equos; cf. Mi. 464 néque eques; Tru. 130. Per. 221 quó iter;—Poe. 1202. Tri. 123 quód homo;—cf. Men. 325. Mi. 684 tú homo; Mi. 966 quía aduléscens; Tri. 871 quíd aduléscens; Men. 75 módo aduléscens; Ba. 1042 vél ut amátor; Cap. 773; Mi. 25; 431; 600; 601; Am. 599 dúm apud-hóstis; As. 852; 867; Ba. 388; Men. 561; Mi. 662; Poe. 339. (*Total* 47.)

IV. S.-I. CONJUNCTION OR PRONOUN + PRONOUN.—Demonstr. pronoun: úbi ea Ba. 203; 472; Mi. 686;—út ea Mi. 346; Poe. 1015; Tri. 1168;—Cap. 970 át ea; Ru. 1081 ét ea; cf. Cap. 942; 774; Mi. 900;—for other examples, v. A. J. P. XXV 148, n. 2. No real exception is Cap. 329 ut éa-quae; Ba. 554, read orárem|u⁶t ei, with admissible hiatus. (*Total* 11.)—(b) Personal: *ego*, exclusive of *ego sum*, *ego me*, etc., receives an accented prefix 156 times in the 10 plays, viz., *án*, *át*, *dúm*, *ét*, *éum*, *íd*, *ídem*, *íta*,

opus-est (Cap. 894; Mi. 705; 765; Ps. 1255, etc.) and *sed ópus-est* (Am. 956; Cas. 427; Ci. 111; Mi. 795, etc.)

¹ For this more frequent position of the poss. *before* the noun, v. Nilsson Pronom. collocat., p. 12.

item, nám, néque, nísi, quám, quási, quíd, quód, quém, quói, quó quóm, séd, sí, tám, úbi, út, vél, etc., also *pól*.¹ The frequent collocations *tibi ego* and *mihi ego* (Kämpf, l. l. 17; Mahler, De pronom. collocat., 49 ff.) occur 14 times (*tibi ego* 2 ce, viz., Au. 45; Tri. 515), cf. Mi. 331:

Mihi ego vídeo, mihi ego sápio, < mihi > ego crédo plúrumúm.

Cases due to analogy, such as *vír ego* (Am. 813), *bónam ego* (Poe. 303), *túam ego* (Tri. 59), *scío ego* (Cap. 326; Mi. 1325; 1343;—in all 8 times in Pl., cf. Kämpf, l. l. 4) occur 12 times. Against these 182 cases of the type *séd ego*, we find only 12 cases which are ambiguous, admitting either *séd égo* or *séd egó*. In 7 of these cases (Am. 933; As. 838; Au. 45; Ba. 965; Men. 463; 484; Tri. 515) we should clearly scan *séd egó*, since *egó* is accepted as an occasional scansion by the best authorities (Leperman, De corrept., 9; Klotz, Grundz., 52; Seyffert, Bursian's Jahresb. 1894, p. 260); in the 5 remaining cases (Au. 811; Ba. 78; Cap. 1000; Mi. 1429; Ru. 464), it is possible that the subject-pronoun, prefixed to the *verb*, forms with it a quadrisyllabic group, i. e. *égo scío*², like *méus pater*, *méus erus*, hence *quod e^lgo-scío*, Mi. 1429. [*Égo scío* occurs in Pl. 8 times, never *ego scío*, viz., Ep. 663; Mer. 453; 888; 889; Mi. 1429; Per. 588; Poe. 1238; Ps. 391;—so *égo voló* 5 times, viz., Cas. 359; Ci. 112; 645; Mer. 460; Mi. 1255;—and in general the type *néque scío* (inclusive of *ego s.*) occurs 14 times, *néque volo* 23 times, the one exception being only apparent, viz., Per. 190 *séd-ita voló te*.]

All these combinations, as well as *etea*, *etille*, *utipse*, etc., are not seldom written together in the Pl. MSS, e. g. *polego* (B or C): Mi. 526; Poe. 1289; St. 108, etc. Note further that *quid ego*, *quid ille*, *quippe ego* take precedence over the *composita quidni* or *quinni* (v. examples in Niemeyer on Mi. 1120), *quidiam* (Ep. 281 *quid ego iam*, cf. Leo, Nachr. d. Gött. Ges., 1895, p. 425), *quippini* (Ps. 895 *quippe ego te ni*), *quidnunc* or *quinnunc* (Ep. 148 *quid tu nunc? patierin?*, where Seyffert's punctuation, Stud.

¹ The citations for 3 plays are: Cap. 102; 310; 312; 556; 640; 660; 821; 827; 839; 879; 886; 899; 901; 934; 961; 962; 995;—Mi. 197; 246; 289; 305; 371; 433; 526; 640; 652; 771; 780; 804; 1120; 1148; 1160; 1206; 1281; 1311; 1328;—Ru. 158; 238; 333; 435; 450; 454; 466; 566; 608; 732; 842; 844; 860; 964; 970; 1006; 1025; 1028; 1048; 1072; 1134; 1297; 1388; 1411. (Total 60.)

² For the regular orders *égo ago*, *égo agam*, cf. Kellerhoff, Studem. Stud. II 54.

Pl., 18, quid tu? nunc patierin? is unnecessary); Pl. uses the formula quid ego nunc faciám in trochaic verse (Mi. 305; Mo. 371, etc.), but in iambic verse he avoids *quid ego* by shifting the order to quid nunc ego faciám (Mer. 712; Ba. 857), cf. Kellerhoff, Studem. Stud., 55. How strong the attraction of conjunctions is for *ego* may be seen from As. 232: *at ego* est etiam prius quam abis quod *volo* loqui; Poe. 924; 1208; Ru. 964; Mi. 352; Eu. 142. Still another proof may be given that these combinations are in a certain sense *composita* (cf. Greek *τρεῖςκαίδεκα*, etc.): Even in those cases where *ego* is most strongly emphatic from the meaning of the sentence, the accent still falls invariably upon the prefix. E. g. Men. 1085 f. *Nón egó.* || *Át egð*; And. 563 *tibi ita hóc vidétur*; *át ego nón posse árbitrór*; Am. 436; 438; 439; 813; Au. 734; Ba. 81; Cap. 310; 934; 961; Men. 439; Mi. 246; 433; Poe. 334; Ru. 566; 964; 1006; 1025; 1411; Tri. 1162; Tru. 946 f., etc.; Hec. 850; Eu. 1086; Lucil. XXVI 16 M.—For somewhat similar uses, cf. the English accents ‘fór-me’, ‘wíth-me’, ‘gíve-me’, ‘dówn-town’, ‘ánd, sir’, ‘nóbody’, ‘ánybody’, ‘I wánt to know’, ‘The fool hath said, There ís-no God’.

In the quadrisyllabic groups, *sed ego-me*, *ego-te*, etc. (TAPA. XXXIV 87, 90), both accents are admissible. The medial accent occurs 8 times: Am. 800; Au. 217; Ba. 886; Cap. 575; Men. 148; 299; Poe. 701; Ru. 1055;—the initial accent is twice as frequent: As. 827; Au. 584; Ba. 149; Cap. 631, etc. Similarly *ego-sum* occurs 14 times: Am. 374; 438; 992; 1021; 1029, etc.; *ego-sum* occurs 4 times: Ba. 949; Men. 302; Poe. 1377; Tri. 447; cf. *ego hómo-sum*, As. 490. For this treatment of *egosum* as a single word, cf. the position of the interrogative *-ne* Mo. 362: *séd-ego-súmne infelix*, which Kämpf, l. l., 43, would needlessly emend.

V. S.-I. CONJUNCTIONS AND PRONOUNS + PRONOM. AD-VERBS AND CONJUNCTIONS.—(a) *Ibí, ita*: Poe. 1132 *quíd ibi*;—*quíd ita* Ba. 87; 680; Tri. 884, v. also Luchs, Hermes VIII 114;—*séd ita* Per. 190; 839; St. 579; Hau. 941;—*án ita* As. 505; Tri. 307;—Am. 572 *íd ita*; Au. 492 *sí ita*; Cap. 622 *át ita*; Mi. 616 *pól ita*; 1120 *ní ita*; 1356 *ét ita* (so ed. mai., but MSS *ét sí ita*); Tri. 311 *té ita*; 343 *út ita*; St. 92 *quía ita*; cf. Mi. 466 *án utrobíque*. Note *ut ibí* As. 709; *at ita-me dí ament* Mi. 501 (TAPA. XXXIV 89); for 3 exceptions, v. p. 267.—(b) *Ubí, uti*: *séd ubi* Am. 504; Ru. 707;—Am. 413 *ét ubi*; Au. 198 *quí*

ubi; Ba. 49 tibi ubi; 84 ego ubi; Cap. 234 id ubi; 290 suo ubi; Men. 10 nisi ubi; Mi. 946 nequid ubi; cf. Am. 9 ea uti; cf. 598; cf. the writing *itauti* in Inscr. (Act. fratr. arv. a. 86, l. 44; a. 87, l. 35). Scan sed ubi Au. 439; Ba. 685; Men. 299; Poe. 1131; Ru. 465.—(c) *Eni(m)*, with prefixes *at*, *ego*, *et*, *id*, *ita*, *neque*, *quia*, etc. (19 times): Am. 266; 410; 666; 694; 759; 1034; As. 33; Ba. 457; 993, etc. In other cases the scansion is not *sed enim*, but *sed enim*, cf. the verse-closes Per. 62 neque enim decet, and Eu. 797 quid agis? tacet. (*Total* 42.)

VI. PRONOUNS (SUBJECT OR OBJECT) + VERB.¹—Quid agis As. 297; Au. 536; Men. 138; Mi. 170; 178; 276; 1139; Poe. 862;—age siquid agis Ep. 196; Mi. 215; Per. 659; St. 715; 717; Tri. 981;—quid agit Ru. 592; Tri. 55;—quid (quod) agat Men. 465; Mi. 205; Tri. 865; 1007; Enn. tr. 185;—idagit Tri. 699 (itagit B); Enn. tr. 186;—see further TAPA. XXXIV 81, and, on the frequency of *ago* with prefixed pronom. object, cf. Lodge, Lex. Pl., p. 80; Thesaurus L. L., p. 1378;—quid ais Am. 364; 848; As. 104; 371; 521; Cap. 577; 612, etc. (21 times in 10 plays);—ecquid ais Poe. 364;—quid ait As. 884; Poe. 1024;—quis ait Cap. 480;—cf. tibi (sibi) ait Men. 1108; Poe. 1018;—Am. 450 quo agis te; 473 quam amat; Au. 467 ubi erat haec;—cf. Ba. 1143. Phor. 435 tibi habe;—Cap. 285. 983 quid erat ei;—Men. 90. Tri. 339 quod edit; Men. 166 quid olet; Mi. 588 id adimatur; 863 quo te agis; 1123 quod agis; 1190 ut eat; 1431 quis erat; Per. 98 quod eat; cf. Ru. 502 tibi erat; 1027 tu abi; 1297 qui habet; Tri. 1078 te agis; 1084 is habitatum huc. (*Total* 64.)

VII. S.-I. CONJUNCTION + VERB.—Si eris As. 228; Cap. 959; 968; Tri. 677 (?); 1068;—ubi eris (erit) Ba. 757; Ep. 279; 423; 656; Tri. 191; And. 684; Caecil. fr. 97;—[other examples of *si*, *eris*, *erit* are Cas. 215 (?); Ci. 48; Ep. 291; 298; Poe. 1228; St. 710; Tri. 388; Tru. 362; 883;—the three foll. are legitimate

¹ I have included in these examples all those forms like *amat*, *erat*, *habet*, *amet*, *agat*, *edit* (followed by an initial vowel), which were, to be sure, not actually short in Pl.'s time (Müller, Pl. Pr., 58 ff.), but which were soon afterwards completely shortened, since they could easily have been used as short under the Brevis Brevians law. Examples of *ais* (cf. Fleckeisen, Jahn's Jahrb. LXI 19) are included for the same reason. Cases of *ero*, *ago*, *emo*, etc., are not included, viz., Tri. 1062 quid ago; Ps. 997 id ago; Men. 106 neque edo neque emo; Ba. 78 is either sci'o quid ago. Et pol (ed. min.), or better: sci'o <ego> quid ago. Et pol ego (ed. mai.)

procell. : As. 110 ūbi ērys ūbiquomque; Per. 469; Tri. 714, cf. Seyffert, Bursian's Jahresb. 1894, p. 282; also Terentianus 2357 is erit anapaestus (Müller, Res Metr. 172.)] séd aperitur Cap. 108; Cas. 779; Men. 108;—Am. 962 séd age; cf. As. 327. Per. 606 áge age; Ba. 702 nísi ut amétis; Tri. 169 ét inhiávit. (Total 15.)

VIII. ADVERB + VERB.—The adverbs *bene*, *male*, *ita*, *mage*, *pote*, *sat*, *domi*, etc., form virtual *composita*: As. 173 mále agis; Tru. 846 béne agis; [false is Au. 658 *ed. min.* male ágit < hic >; Leo male égit];—sát agit As. 440; Hau. 225;—As. 844 mále habet; Men. 801 béne habet; 386 máge amet; Mi. 232 béne amet (on the formula ita mé di béne ament, v. Hauler on Phor. 165);—Mi. 191. 194 dómi habet, cf. the frequent dómitiónem, as Lucil. XXVI 34. Virtual *composita* also are *beneolet* (cf. beneolentia, Hieron.), *maleolet*, *poterit*, *beneerit*, *maleerit*, *saterit*¹ (cf. Mart. Cap. V § 539 sat eritque), *satscio* (cf. hauscio), *maletractat* (maletractatio, Arnob.); v. also Hauler's note, Phor. 788, on *beneparta* (mei patris beneparta) used substantively like *benefacta*, *benedicta*, and for cases of *bene agere*, *male agere*, *sat agere*, v. Lodge, Lex. Pl., p. 79 f.; of rare occurrence here are the tmesis-forms, e. g., Syr. sent. 332 male sécum agit; Pl. Ep. 696 béne hoc habét; Mo. 709. Similarly *mage amo* (*mageamo*) is almost as genuine a compound in Pl. as *mavolo*; for, of the 10 cases in which the form *mage* occurs, 6 involve this combination (Leo, Forsch., p. 264). The full form *mágis-amo* also occurs (Mo. 231; Mi. 1263, etc.), just as *sátis-habet* and *sátis-scio* are used by the side of the usual *sáthabet* (13 times) and *sátsciō* (14 times), both of which observe an invariable order in the dramatists.² With the full pyrrhic forms also (*bene*, *male*, etc.) we have always the recessive accent, as in *bénéfacis*, *bénevale* (Kellerhoff, Studem. Stud. II 82), *bénevolo*, *bénemerens*, etc.; thus, according to Ahlberg's collection, the dramatists have 15 examples of procell. like *bene fáctis*, *male fáctis* (trisyllabic verb), but not one example of *bene fácis*, *male fácis* (dissyllabic verb). We find instead always *béne facis*, etc., with the single exception that the less frequent and less fixed secondary accent does not always

¹ Cf. the writing satest Tru. 22; 542; 644 (B), saterat Poe. 458 (B), satesse Per. 686 (C); also iterant (edd. ita erant) Mo. 640 (BC), cf. itast.

² Scarcely an exception is Ru. 292 id *sat est* habendum; improbable is the usual correction in Au. 187: sat hábes (MSS satís habes).

recede, e. g., St. 117 *male fáci|undíst*; Inc. tr. fr. 160. In view of these facts, the frequent tmesis-forms (Ritschl, Opusc. II 721, Anm.) and the separate orthography of the republican Inscr. (Corssen, Ausspr. II² 887) are far from determining the question of the accent.

IX. ANALOGICAL INFLUENCE OF TRADITIONAL ORDERS.—Some examples have been already cited above (pp. 268, 271); in addition we may refer to this class the foll.: Au. 6 *míhi avos*; 64 *quóque habet*;—Au. 680. Mi. 859 *mé erus*; Cap. 148 *égo aliénus*;—Men. 502. Mi. 427 *míhi odiósus*; Men. 661 *túa ut opínor*; 675 *síbi inimícus*; Mi. 99 *míhi aduléscens*; 225 *hanc rém age*; 332 *mé homo*; 741 *tám in amíci*; Poe. 874 *cíto homo*; Ru. 733 *ví agis*; 1404 *pálam age*; Tri. 51 *túa agit úxor* (A); 93 *ád inimíci*; 311 *té ita*; 388 *túom erit*. (*Total* 20.)

Finally, the recessive accent is clearly illustrated by those cases in which several examples of its use occur in the same verse. E. g.

Cap. 1005: *Séd erus éccum ante óstium, ét erus álter éccum ex Álidé*.

Mer. 744: *Nam quí amat quód amat sí habet, íd habet pró cibó*.

Cf. Tri. 980 (*is eras, quí eras, quí tum nó'n erás*); Mo. 1100 (*quód agas, íd agas*); Poe. 867 (*quód edis, quód ames*, acc. to P.); Per. 592 (*quíd ita? quíd enim?*); Mi. 352 (*séd ego quód ago*); St. 539. 44. 46. 49. 52. 53 (*quási ego* 6 times), etc.

That it long continued in use may be seen from the cases of hiatus which the dactylic poets permit after unaccented monosyllables (monosyllables in thesis), cf. L. Müller, R. M.², 371f. E. g. Lucil. I 32 M. *quăm hómó*; XXX 24 *quó éám*; Verg. Ecl. 8, 108 *án quí ámant*; Cat. 97, 1 *mé dí ámént*; Hor. S. 1, 9, 38 *sí mě ámás*; 2, 2, 28 *nūm ádést*, etc.

ELMIRA COLLEGE, ELMIRA, N. Y.

R. S. RADFORD.